DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 204 FL 019 695

AUTHOR Gebhard, J. G.; Duncan, Barbara
TITLE EFL Teacher Education Curriculum Development as Inquiry: The Orosz Szakos Tanarok Atkepzesi Program.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on Second Language Teacher Education (Kowloon, Hong Kong, April 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Continuing Education; *Curriculum Development; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Formative Evaluation; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Language Teachers; Program Descriptions; Program Design; *Relevance (Education); Russian; Second Language Instruction; *Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS *Janus Pannonius University (Hungary)

ABSTRACT

A discussion of language teacher education focuses on the importance of making formative curriculum evaluation and curriculum development an integral part of the teacher education program. The paper begins with a description of the Russian Teacher Reeducation Program in Hungary, at Janus Pannonius University, a rigorous inservice program for Russian language teachers. A 2-week intensive summer component was designed initially by talking with Russian teachers, Hungarian and American administrators, and a Hungarian professor and students and by studying reference materials and the grant proposal. As the process of developing, delivering, implementing, and evaluating the curriculum progressed, formal inquiry continued through discussion and conferences, interviews, and observation. The learner-centered approach used in the summer curriculum was extended into the fall program component. It is concluded that the use of ongoing inquiry into the effectiveness and appropriateness of the teacher education curriculum, with resulting information incorporated into the program immediately, is valuable for making informed curriculum decisions, improving relevance, widening teacher horizons, opening channels of communication, and creating a learning process for the teacher educator. A 23-item bibliography is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gebhard J.G
Duncan, Barbara
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 339204

EFL Teacher Education Curriculum Development as Inquiry: The Orosz Szakos Tanárok Atképzési Program

J.G. Gebhard and Barbara Duncan
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Paper presented at the International Conference on Second Language Teacher Education, City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, Kowloon, Hong Kong, April, 1991

FL 019695

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EFL Teacher Education Curriculum Development as Inquiry: The Orosz Szakos Tanarok Atkepzesi Program

J. G. Gebhard and Barbara Duncan
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

INTRODUCTION

One purpose of this paper is to emphasize the importance for teacher educators to make on-going inquiry a part of their program curriculum, in short, to continuously learn about the program from the participants' perspective. As Dubin and Wong (1990) put it:

> Teacher educators must strive to understand the context of teaching through their participants' perspective, a goal that is more significant, we believe, than bringing the latest word about theory or practice to teachers in the trenches (p. 282).

However, it is not enough to simply understand the program from the participants' view. Teacher educators need to act on this knowledge. Thus, a second purpose is to emphasize the need for teacher educators to adjust the curriculum based on the knowledge they gain from inquiry. A third purpose is to describe and illustrate the development of a specific teacher education curriculum in which inquiry had played a significant part.

We begin with a brief description of The Russian Teacher Reeducation Program in Hungary, followed by a description of the program curriculum we created during the summer and fall of 1990 while working within this program. Our discussion centers on how inquiry influenced our decisions in the development of the curriculum. We conclude with a discussion on the value of on-going inquiry as the basis for curriculum development in teacher education.

THE RUSSIAN TEACHER REEDUCATION PROJECT: BACKGROUND

In the spring of 1989 a decision was made by the Hungarian Minister of Education at that time, Ferenc Glatz, that Russian was no longer a compulsory subject in the schools. Since students had been required to take eight years of Russian as a required subject, there was a need for a great many Russian teachers in Hungary. The change thus created a problem: what happens to all the Russian teachers?

In response to the need to reeducate Russian teachers into new fields, the Minister of Education offered each school a sum of money (per Russian teacher) for their reeducation, and Janus Pannonius University initiated the first reeducation program in the spring of 1990. The following quote from a World Bank funding proposal provides a rationale as to the need for an on-going program to reeducate Russian teachers to be English teachers:

> The function and position of foreign languages changed dramatically in Hungary in the past year. The radical reorientation of the whole social and political structure, the double transformation, the change of socialist economy into market economy and that of authoritarian rule into democracy basically altered the function and position of education, and in it language teaching. The earlier limited international connection has become a vital need in surviving under the new circumstances. English is especially important in this respect. Russian is no longer a mandatory foreign language in schools and English is selected by most of the students as the first foreign language. (Bokay and Radnai, 1990).

Gaining entrance to the program is competitive. The basic entrance requirements include the successful completion of at least a four year college degree in Russian, the successful passing of the national exam in English at an intermediate

level, passing an interview at the university, and gaining permission from the secondary or primary school in which the teacher is employed. The initial program is composed of two groups of teachers, twelve from Zala County and ten from Baranya County.

Understandably, those responsible for the program have had very little experience with curriculum development. As such, the program is "course" based and does not incorporate many of the curriculum development components found in some other programs (needs analysis, objectives based on needs, program evaluation). Selection of content seems to be modeled after the curriculum for English majors at Janus Pannonius University and includes classes in advanced language, methodology, British and American History and Literature, and Applied Linguistics.

During the regular semester, the teachers study every other Thursday and Friday, a total of 112 hours each semester. In addition, during the summer, the Russian teachers are required to attend a two week intensive summer curriculum, and teacher educators from abroad are invited by the Soros Foundation to design and implement this curriculum. We were fortunate to be selected to take on this task, but even more fortunate to be asked to continue during the fall semester as a part of the "larger curriculum".

AN "INQUIRY BASED" TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM CURRICULUM

Our "curriculum within a curriculum" followed a process of curriculum development found in most learner centered language

teaching programs (Nunan, 1988; Johnson, 1989; Richards, 1990). Thus, we approached curriculum development through needs analysis, objective setting, selection and organization of course content, assessment of students' progress and evaluation of the processes which possibly contributed to this progress. In agreement with such teacher educators as Dubin and Wong (1990) and Rubdy (1989), we also went beyond these processes as entities in themselves to include "inquiry" as central to our planning, delivery, and assessment of the teacher education curriculum.

As Table One shows, our curriculum development process included (1) planning and drafting the curriculum for the summer program, (2) delivering the curriculum (3) evaluating the curriculum, (4) planning the new curriculum for the fall semester based on the evaluation, and (5) delivering the Fall curriculum. To accomplish these steps in the development of the curriculum, a process of inquiry was also needed.

The Inquiry Process: Planning & Designing the Summer Curriculum

In attempt to understand the teachers' needs, set objectives, select and organize content, and consider teaching materials and ways of using these materials, we spent three months inquiring about the Russian Teacher Reeducation Program. Our goal was to gain some understanding of what the program means from the perspective of the program participants, and to do this we followed the advice of ethnographers (Agar, 1980; McDermott, Gospodinoff, and Aron, 1978; Spindler, 1982; Spradely, 1979;

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: A PROCESS OF INQUIRY

Development Process	Inquiry Process
PLANNED/DESIGNED THE CURRICULUM (3 months) * Did preliminary needs analysis * Set objectives * Selected and organized content * Considered teaching materials and activities	TALKED WITH + Russian teachers + Administrators (Hungarian & American) + Hungarian professor + Hungarian students COLLECTED & STUDIED + Reference books + Grant proposal
DELIVERED THE CURRICULUM (4 weeks) * Implemented plan * Did on-going needs analysis * Considered future objectives * Considered future content * Analyzed consequences of teaching	TALKED ABOUT NEEDS WITH + Hungarian administrators + Teachers in program (in/out of class) DISCUSSED NEEDS & PROGRAM + Teachers in program (through journals)
EVALUATED THE CURRICULUM (4 weeks) * Evaluated objectives * Evaluated relevancy of content * Evaluated overall consequences of courses	INFORMALLY INTERVIEWED + Teachers in program REFLECTED THROUGH + Review of teachers' journals + Notes and lesson plans
PLANNED NEW CURRICULUM * Reanalyzed needs * Set new objectives * Selected new content * Selected new materials * Reconsidered teaching behaviors	CONFERENCED WITH + Other teacher educators + Some teachers in program
DELIVERED REVISED CURRICULUM (3 months) * Implemented new plan * Continued needs analysis * Analyzed consequences of teaching	OBSERVED + Teachers teaching DISCUSSED NEEDS WITH + Teachers in program (in/out of class)

Watson-Gegeo, 1988). However, at the start of our inquiry process we were limited by circumstances. For the most part, we did not have direct access to the program itself, including the Russian teachers directly involved in the program. The best we could do was to inquire indirectly, use our experience to imagine the context from the participants' point of view, and realize that our understanding was shallow at best.

Nonetheless, we had high spirits, a will to learn, and access to sets of inquiry based questions (Dubin and Wong, 1990) with which to begin, as well as access to Hungarian students and professors at our home university and the Hungarian Russian Teacher Reeducation Program Director (who visited IUP). One of us also had the opportunity to visit Janus Pannonius University for one week on a related matter. Since the purpose of this visit was to participate in the selection of Russian teachers to study in the U.S., it provided an opportunity to better understand the context of the Russian Teacher Reeducation Program, especially from the perspective of Russian teachers.

We asked a great variety of different questions, including questions about the historical significance of the program, administrative aspects of the program, the language learning and teaching experience of the Russian teachers, and the expectations of the teachers and administration for the summer program. (See Appendix A for a list of these questions). Although coming from indirect sources, answers to these questions proved valuable when making decisions about our objectives for the teachers, content

selection, and how we could present and organize this content.

The Result of Inquiry: The Summer Curriculum Plan

When drafting the summer curriculum, we first considered what Russian teachers and administrators thought the teachers needed. As we understood it, the teachers needed:

* Practice in using English to communicate; development of their own abilities to interact in English
* Exposure to teaching language as development of skills through interaction.

We also set tentative objectives, including:

* Teachers will gain experience and confidence in using English to participate in whole class and small group discussions.
* Teachers will gain in their abilities to react to literature on ESL/EFL teaching, raise questions about the relationship between teaching and learning, and consider answers to their own questions.
* Teachers will gain an understanding of simulations, problem solving activities, role plays, language games, and other activities which demonstrate how EFL students can learn to interact.

After consideration of the teachers' needs and our objectives, we were able to organize the content of the program into connected courses. Since we were told that we would be working with two groups, 20 hours each week, we decided to organize the teachers' experience into three connected courses. Our goal was to organize the course content so that the teachers could experience multiple activities around certain themes (e.g., teaching reading as an interactive process) across each course. By having opportunities to process ideas about teaching through

multiple activities, we thought teachers would have a better chance of understanding what interactive language teaching involves and develop their own ideas about how to implement what they learn (Gebhard, 1990; Gebhard, Gaitan and Oprandy, 1987).

The plan was to make the center of the curriculum the EFL Methodology seminar (90 minutes/daily). In this course teachers would discuss readings about teaching, raise issues and concerns about the ideas in the readings, and relate their own language learning and teaching experience to the readings. Closely connected a course called English for English Teachers was planned (also 90 minutes/daily). In this class teachers would participate in either teacher educator led or peer led role play activities directly related to what the teachers had read about and discussed in the Methodology Seminar. The second planned support class was Video Viewing, through which the teachers would participate in viewing tapes of American TV comedy and EFL/ESL Methodology (e.g., TPR and the Natural Approach). Emphasis would be on comprehension of the content, as well as entertainment.

The curriculum plan also included a journal component in which the teachers are required to react to the content of the readings and classroom activities (Porter, et al. 1990). (See later discussion).

We also considered our approach to teaching. We decided that since we were going to teach language as interaction, we would do our best to demonstrate this through our own teaching. Thus, following the ideas in the text readings on teaching English as a

process of interaction, we planned to set tasks for teachers to work on in groups and individually, engage the teachers in reading, writing, and talking about ways to teach English (rather than lecture), apply our knowledge about how to make content comprehensible, interesting, and engaging to students, and create information gaps through which knowledge and opinions could be shared.

Materials were also selected, far more than we could possibly use. The text selected to be central to our teaching was Interactive Language Teaching (Rivers, ed., 1986). Supportive text materials included Methodology in TESOL (Long and Richards, eds., 1987), the past six years of English Teaching Forum, and a small library of books and articles on EFL/ESL teaching. Other materials included role plays, simulations, language learning games, jazz chants, songs, lesson plans, example text books, short stories, poems, audio tapes and listening activities, authentic reading materials, and more.

Delivering the Curriculum

The next step was to deliver the curriculum, and as planned, lessons aimed at introducing students to interactive language teaching while at the same time giving them opportunities to develop their own English language skills. To do this, we purposely implemented activities in which the teachers would be required to interact with each other and the teacher educators in English. For example, lessons on teaching reading skills were organized so that the teachers studied how reading can be taught

as an interactive process while at the same time experience language in the classroom as interaction, both as teachers and as EFL learners. We asked the teachers how they teach reading, then gave a preview of an article, "Interaction of reader and text" (Papalia, 1987) which the teachers were to read for homework. The next day, the teachers discussed how successful readers interact with text and ways teachers can introduce text to students to facilitate interaction (e.g., how to do pre-reading activities to build schemata, how to remove difficulties for students, and how to check comprehension), as well as broke into small groups to select their favorite activities from the article which promote interaction between the reader and text (e.g., having students draw pictures to illustrate what was just read; having students write their own questions about the reading for classmates to answer). This was followed by teachers experiencing a variety of reading activities, such as reading a short story written by one of the teacher educators (based on a set of photographs) and then putting the photos in the order of the story, followed by retelling the story in their own words and asking the teacher educator questions about the photographs.

They also experienced a short story through the use of the techniques to facilitate interaction between the reader and text. The teachers were given a short story about a hiker in the early 1900s called "Odd Tippling" (Kusenberg, 1987). They were then asked about their own experiences as hikers, to scan the story for unfamiliar words, discuss these words, and paraphrase the

first part of the story. Since the ending to the story was purposely deleted, the teachers were asked to write their own ending for homework (which they read to classmates the next day). They then met in small groups, wrote a group ending, read each of the group endings, and voted on the one they like the most. Finally, the teachers reacted to the reading and classroom activities in their journals, as well as raised questions for the teacher educators to answer about teaching reading through interactive activities.

The teachers' journals were considered to be a major part of their learning experience. They were expected to write in them daily, following general guidelines (which were adapted from Porter, Goldstein, Leatherman, and Conrad, 1990), including:

* Describe and react to class discussion
* Ask questions about the readings & class discussion
* Relate readings/discussions to your own experience
* React to something said in class
* React to something you read
* Argue for or against something you read/discussed
* Describe new knowledge you have obtained
* Fit new knowledge into what you already know
* Question the applications, motivations, uses, or significance of what you have learned

Teachers handed in their journals twice during the summer, and it was our jobs as teacher educators to respond to questions, reacted to comments (nonjudgmentally), expand on points made, and ask the teachers questions. The idea was to encourage discussion about teaching and learning, raise questions and issues, and to use the journal as a means to individualize learning.

Inquiry while Delivering the Curriculum

We thought of the summer program not only as a chance to

deliver our curriculum, but also an opportunity to learn as much as possible about the teachers' needs and interests. Through our inquiry in the summer, we hoped to learn enough to provide learning experiences in the fall that would be more relevant to the teachers' needs.

We emphasize that although we relied heavily on the teachers' perceptions of what they need (mainly because we were with them most of the time), we did not neglect other program participants' views. For example, we talked with the chair of the English Department. As he was aware of the origin of the program and the context of teaching languages in Hungary, he proved to be a valuable resource for information about the teachers needs from a political and administrative point of view. As Dubin and Wong frame it, all attempts were made "to understand the belief system that motivate behavior in the host culture" (1990:286), and such an understanding could come from a large number of sources.

In order to better understand the program from the participants perspective, as discussed earlier, we asked many questions, but did not do formal interviewing. Rather we asked these questions in naturally occurring contexts, such as during lunch, during class discussions, and through dialogue journal correspondence. We also paid attention to the questions others asked and statements they made, especially the teachers.

We were also sensitive to our own behaviors. We attempted to approach most discussions from a nonjudgmental perspective and to take a "one-down" position (Agar, 1980), an attitude that we did

not know very much about the Hungarian teaching settings nor what it means to be a Russian teacher being reeducated as an English teacher. In short, we welcomed the administrators' and teachers' views and values about teaching and learning; we did our best to be open, to let the participants in the program teach us about what it means to be a participant in the program. Techniques we applied to do this included lots of paraphrasing to check our understanding, use of clarification questions, and cross-checking (for example, asking several participants the same questions).

Although chats and discussions gave us much knowledge about the program, the most valuable source proved to be the teachers' journals. These journals, described above, not only functioned as a means to communicate with the teachers and to give them practice with language, but proved to be a wonderful source for inquiry into concerns that teachers have and what they believe they need for their development.

Through the journals, we were able to discover the kinds of concerns that teachers had about interactive language teaching. For example, several teachers expressed concern about their inexperience with teaching English and their feelings of inadequacy in English. As one of the teachers stated (and others agreed with):

> Even (if) I would like to try out how interactive language teaching works, I can't always put communication instead of grammar into focus simply because I myself can't judge exactly what words, expressions to use in certain situations...(I'm) afraid that (if) I initiate spontaneous activities, I won't be able to guide and control also spontaneously. So the whole thing would lose its life-like and informal

> character...If the teacher had to say, "Sorry, I don't know how to say it in English". So, I don't risk departure from the security of our traditional book, though it's really bad.

The majority of teachers also had reservations about the applicability of interactive teaching to their contexts. Several teachers wrote about how interactive language teaching is not relevant to them due to their being forced to teach to the national exam in English. One of the teachers addressed this concern to this classic problem in the following words:

> If the teacher wants her students (to) do well at university, get to university, pass the state exam in English, she has to concentrate on form, to focus on grammar because of our examination system.

Teachers also pointed out these concerns:

* That preparation to teach language as interaction takes much time (something they don't believe they have).
* That most of their students would never have to interact in English, so why put so much effort into teaching them to do this.
* That three to five hours a week of lessons was not enough time to enable students to express much more than pleasant formulas of language.
* That "freedom" to teach how they want to teach is so new to them, that they are not comfortable with change. They know how to teach through a prescriptive Prussian pedagogy, and although they don't like it, they simply fear changing to something different.

Evaluation as Inquiry

First of all, evaluation is ongoing. It can (and should) be done as a part of each step in the development of the curriculum. However, it is also possible to take the time to do a more formal evaluation of the program from time to time. With this more

formal evaluation in mind, at the end of the summer program, we reviewed the journals (which we copied), consulted our notes, and reflected on what went on in the curriculum. We also informally interviewed several teachers. Our objective was to appraise whether or not we reached our objectives, to consider whether the content was relevant, and evaluate (the best we could) the overall consequences of our efforts.

Evaluation of the Summer Curriculum

It was difficult to know whether or not the teachers language had improved in such a short amount of time. We recognized that some teachers who would not speak at the beginning were speaking more frequently with us and each other in English. Some teachers also clearly improved in their ability to interact with the teacher educators through writing. A dialogue was established through the journals in which some teachers became quite engaged. In addition, many of the teachers seemed to gain in their ability to react to literature on EFL teaching methodology. Some raised more questions and wrote more elaborate opinions by the end of the two week summer session.

Although it is not clear if every teacher gained in the their language abilities, it is clear that the majority of the teachers gained a fairly solid understanding of what interactive language teaching entails, as well as a new lexicon through which to process ideas about teaching. As one teacher put it:

> I got to know plenty of new techniques, procedures, activities I'll try to use in the future. It was also fascinating to read texts on methodology in English. I've learnt - passively at least - hundreds of new

> words and expressions that i badly need when speaking about classroom activities.

Feedback was also given by teachers on our methodology, and such feedback is indeed useful when evaluating and planning the direction of the curriculum. Here is one example:

> One thing that made a deep impression on me was the way you showed to use how to put theory into practice. I'm sure all of us enjoyed the demonstrations of the ideas and activities we had read about the nights before. Last but not least, it was extremely interesting for me to observe and discover the main characteristics of the ideal "interactive" teacher in the way you behaved, talked to and with us, controlled unobtrusively the lessons. It was great!

However, the majority of teachers did not seem to gain a firmer definition of themselves as teachers, their own philosophy of teaching and the kinds of roles they could take on as language teachers. They seemed confused about whether or not to implement the new ideas. As one teacher said during a seminar:

> Your lessons are very interesting...I like it very much, communication...But, such lessons are a very big change in primary school. Children want grammar to pass government English exam. My role is to drill students, teach them grammar and translation...But, I wonder. Maybe to teach them how to interact in English will be better for them, more useful to them.

Planning and Delivering the Fall Curriculum

As the list below shows, we recognized the need to continue with some of the same objectives, as well as to shift emphasis based on what we had learned about the teacher's concerns.

- Based on their concern with their own language problems, continue to build the teachers' confidence in using English as a means of interact in speech and writing.

* Continue to show them what interactive language teaching can be. Based on their concern that interactive language teaching takes too much time to prepare, show teachers that they can do activities with students that encourage interaction in English, but do not very take much time to prepare.

* Acknowledge their belief that they need to "teach to the test". Show them ways to adjust their teaching so that they can work toward having students achieve on the government exam and learn to interact in English.

* Based on their confusion about who they are as teachers, widen the scope of their experience to give them chances to develop as teachers. Give them experiences which allow them to make decisions about their own approach to teaching, how they can design lessons to match this approach, and how their design can be implemented into classroom procedures.

During the Fall semester, the teachers would continue their study within the "larger curriculum", and as such, we could only meet with them for two hours every other week. Thus, our plan was to provide specific lessons which would address our stated objectives (above). These lessons included:

* Frame the teachers experience in the Methodology Seminar on the concepts of "Approach", "Design", and "Procedure" (Richards and Rodgers, 1986). Gear many of the lessons toward having students define their own teaching in relation to these three levels of analysis. In addition, define the approach, design, and procedures that teachers use who confront language teaching as interaction between the students, the teacher, and the task.

* Challenge the teachers to more clearly define interaction in the classroom. Such activities as "How Communicative?" (Ellis, 1986), in which teachers experience, measure, and rank a variety of communicative classroom activities by using specific criteria based on properties of communication.

* Challenge the teachers to be observe their own teaching and the teaching of others more critically (but not judgmentally). To accomplish this, the teachers would be asked to read articles on observation (Day, 1990; Fanselow, 1988; Gebhard, in press) and action research (Nunan, 1990), observe teaching, and discuss what they have learned from the experience.

* Show teachers ways that teachers in other nations "teach to the test" and teach students how to communicate in English.

* Give teachers chances to discuss issues and concerns they have about teaching and learning through "Buzz Group" sessions.

CONCLUSION: THE VALUE OF ON-GOING INQUIRY

In this paper we have shown how we have included a process of on-going inquiry as a way to make curriculum development decisions. We have found on-going inquiry to be valuable for the development of a curriculum in a number of ways, and as a way to conclude, we point these out.

First, treating curriculum development as a process of inquiry provides the means to make more informed decisions about what objectives to attempt to reach, what content to select, and how to organize and present this content. It also makes decision making easier because the process of inquiry continues to inform the teacher educator about the on-going needs and concerns of the teachers.

Inquiry also can make the content of the curriculum more intrinsically relevant to the teachers. As Rubdy (1989) points out, this is because the teachers "perceive it as an activity directly addressed to their needs as individual teachers, and

relate to it in terms of their own personal framework of thinking" (pp. 10-11). As Britten (1988) and Rubdy (1989) point out, transfer of the experiences in the teacher education classes to the teachers way of teaching can only happen if the teachers feel personal commitment to teaching differently. Inquiry can provide a way for the teacher educator to recognize the kinds of interests, concerns, and commitment teachers have, and as such, adjust what is done in the curriculum to better match these interests, concerns, and commitments.

In addition, the teacher educators' engagement in a process of discovery about the concerns of the teachers can have consequences within itself, especially if the teacher educators are genuinely concerned about the development of the teachers. Teachers sometimes realize the amount of time and energy that is being put into their education, and as a possible consequence, some teachers seem to be more accepting of new ideas.

Inquiry also opens up channels of communication that might otherwise not be open. It provides a means for discussion about relevant and interesting content and it can make teaching an interesting and rewarding experience.

Finally, inquiry can provide the opportunity for the teacher educator to change. Inquiry can, in short, be a process of learning for the teacher educator. Teachers, especially those with much experience, can challenge the teacher educator to change his or her beliefs about teaching and learning, and when the learner becomes the teacher educator's teacher, and the

teacher educator gains fresh insight into the relationship between teaching and learning as a result, the job of approaching curriculum development as a process of inquiry becomes an even more worthwhile experience.

References

Agar, M. (1980). The professional stranger: An informal introduction to ethnography. New York: Academic Press.

Bokay, A. and Rodnai, Z. (1990). Regional program for the development of teacher training in foreign languages, World Bank Grant Proposal. Pecs, Hungary: Janus Pannonius University.

Britten, D. (1988). Three stages in teacher training. ELT Journal 42(1):3-8.

Day, R. (1990). Teacher observation in second language teacher education. In J.C. Richards and D. Nunan (Eds.), Second Language Teacher Education, pp. 43-61, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dubin, F. and Wong, R. (1990). An ethnographic approach to inservice preparation: The Hungary file. In J.C. Richards and D. Nunan (Eds.), Second Language Teacher Education, pp. 282-292, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1986). Activities and procedures for teacher education. ELT Journal 40(2):91-99 (Reprinted in J.C. Richards and D. Nunan, Eds., Second Language Teacher Education, pp. 26-36. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fanselow, J. F. (1988). "Let's see": Contrasting conversations about teaching. TESOL Quarterly 22(1): 113-20. (Reprinted in J.C. Richards and D. Nunan, Eds., Second Language Teacher Education, pp. 182-97. New York: Cambridge University Press).

Gebhard, J.G. (1990). Interaction in a teaching practicum. In J.C. Richards and D. Nunan (Eds.), Second Language Teacher Education, pp. 118-131. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gebhard, J.G. (1991). Seeing teaching differently: The teacher as observer. The Language Teacher 15(5):7-11.

Gebhard, J.G., Gaitan, S. and Oprandy, R. (1987). Beyond prescription: The student-teacher as investigator. Foreign Language Annals 20(3):227-32. (Reprinted in J.C. Richards and D. Nunan, Eds., Second Language Teacher Education, pp. 16-25. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, R.K. (1989). The second language curriculum. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kusenberg, K. (1986). Odd tippling. In T. Lewis and R. Jungman (eds.), On Being Foreign: Culture Shock in Short Fiction, pp. 51-53. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Long, M. and Richards, J.C. (1987). Methodology in TESOL. New York: Longman.

McDermott, R., Gospodinoff, P. and Aron, J. (1978). Criteria for an ethnographically adequate description of concerted activities and their contexts. Semiotica 24(3/4):245-75.

Nunan, D. (1988). The learner-centered curriculum. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Papalia, A. (1987). Interaction of reader and text. In W. Rivers (Ed.), Interaction Language Teaching, pp. 57-69. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. (1990). The language teaching matrix. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T. (1986). Approaches and methods in language teaching. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W.M. (1987). Interactive language teaching. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rubdy, R. (1989). Maximizing intrinsic relevance in teacher education in ELT. RELC Journal 20(2):10-22.

Spindler, G. (1982). Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spradely, J. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Watson-Gegeo, K.A. (1988). Ethnography in ESL: Defining the essentials. TESOL Quarterly 22(4):375-92.

Appendix A

Inquiry: The Russian Teacher Reeducation Program

Questions: The Historical Significance of the Program

What is the history of Russian teaching in Hungary?

How does the recent mandate that Russian no longer be a required subject in schools effect Russian teachers?

How many Russian teachers does this mandate effect? What alternatives do these Russian teachers have? How many will possibly be retrained as English teachers?

Questions: Administrative

How difficult is it to get into the retraining program? What are the entrance requirements? Who makes the decisions?

What do the teachers study during the academic year? Is there a curriculum? Can we gain access? How was it designed?

Questions: Teachers Language Learning & Teaching History

How proficient are these teachers in Russian? Are they able to communicate in Russian? What exposure have the teachers had to Russian as a spoken language? A written language? Were there opportunities for them to study in the Soviet Union?

How were these teachers educated to be Russian teachers? What was the pedagogical orientation they received? How much Russian teaching experience do the teachers have?

How proficient are these teachers in English? Are they able to communicate in English? What exposure have they had to English as a spoken language? A written language? Have they taken any national level exams? If so, what exams? Is it possible to gain access to their exam scores? What previous training have these teachers had in learning English? Have any of the teachers studied English abroad?

Are any of the teachers presently teaching English? If so, what training have they received to be English teachers? Are they supervised on the job? If so, what is the nature of this supervision? Do they participate in any in-service workshops? What levels have they taught?

How many of these teachers are presently teaching Russian?

Questions: The Summer Program Curriculum

What are the starting and ending dates? How many hours each day can be devoted to classroom activities? What other kinds of activities are possible (outside the classroom)?

What types of courses are we expected to design? Do teachers expect a lecture format? Do they expect hands-on experience? Will they be comfortable in participatory activities? What content would be interesting to the teachers? Relevant? Do they expect theory or practice? Theory into practice? Only practical knowledge?

What support is available? Can we have assistants? Is it possible to involve the Peace Corp volunteers who are undergoing Peace Corp training at the same location during the same summer?

What materials and media are available at Janus Pannonius? Is their a listening lab? A computer lab? A library of ESL/EFL texts and materials? Video tapes and films? Can we gain access? What about technology? Is there an American VCR system available? A video camera? Overhead projector? Slide projector? How difficult is access to these things? What about Peace Corp materials/media and technology? Can we gain access to their materials/media and equipment?